



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/622,144	07/18/2003	Melissa Wiedemann	017750-420	1878

7590 08/27/2008
PATRICK C. KEANE
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

RASHID, DAVID

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/27/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Attachment to Paper 20080825

[1] Applicant's Response to Final Rejection filed August 18, 2008 with respect to claim 1 have been respectfully and fully considered, but not found persuasive.

Summary of Remarks regarding claim 1:

Applicant argues that the Office has incorrectly asserted that the storage of edge values at the various resolutions is used to identify another object. In particular, the Office asserted that "identified object 1311 at second resolution is used to identify those features of higher resolution (e.g., mouth) using items 1005, 1007, 1009 of fig. 10 (i.e. matching features across scales, including matching the identified object item 1311 at second resolution to see consistency with another object at the first resolution) to identify another object (the mouth and hair in item 1319 of fig. 13)." This assertion is not supportable.

First, the matching of edges at the various resolutions in items 1309, 1311 and 1313 does not have any relation to identifying another object. On the contrary, the matching of edges is performed to determine whether an edge of one object in image 1309 matches an edge of the same object in image 1311, and/or matches an edge of the same object in image 1313. The determination of edge consistency for any object does not have any relation to identifying another object at a higher resolution.

Second, the edge detection values stored in compressed data file 1321 are unique to one object, i.e. object 1 1323 and object 2 1325. The edge detection values are stored and compared to determine whether a detected edge in one resolution is consistent with a detected edge at

Art Unit: 2624

another resolution. This detection process has no relationship with identifying another object. On the contrary, another object will have separate edge detection values, as evidenced by the separate values stored in the compressed data file 1321 for each object. These stored values of one object do not have any relationship to and are not used for identifying another object within the image.

In particular, Bonneau does not disclose or suggest that the detected edge values stored in the compressed data file 1321 for the mouth in image 1301 (object 1) are used to identify another object, such as the hair in item 1319 (or item 1301). On the contrary, the hair in item 1319 is detected independent of the edge block analysis performed at the second and third resolutions (scales), because the edge block analysis at the different resolutions pertains only to comparing whether the same edge is detected at the various resolutions. The detection or processing of another object (e.g., the hair in image 1301, 1319) is independent from the processing any object in images 1309, 1311. (Response to Final Rejection at 10-11, Aug. 18, 2008.)

Examiner's Response regarding claim 1:

The Examiner believes that the Applicant has misrepresented Examiner's interpretation of "object". The Applicant's interpretation of "object" is that reflected in fig. 13 consistent with the disclosed "OBJECT 1", "OBJECT 2" at item 1321. Applicant's interpretation separates and distinguishes each object with that of a particular part of the face (e.g., nose), and argues (in summary) that an identified nose in no way helps identify another facial feature (e.g., eye). Applicant's interpretation has strongly correlated the use of "object" in claim 1 with the objects in item 1321.

However, the claims in question are broad enough to support the Examiner's interpretation of which identified an "object" as an area of blocks that may or may not be an object consistent with those identified in fig. 13 (*i.e.*, "OBJECT 1"). The objects the Examiner was referring to were those blocks (the actual blocks, or collection of boxes in each image resolution) as shown in fig. 13 (*e.g.*, items 1309, 1311, and 1313 are all comprised of blocks which the Examiner referred to as the objects). Nowhere in the rejection of claim 1 refers to items 1321, 1323, or 1325.

Item 1311 (of the second resolution) was processed to identify the blocks in item 1311 (as shown in fig. 13 as a configuration of identified blocks). Item 1313 (of the first resolution) identifies another object (the object being comprised of smaller blocks), using the object identified at the first resolution because the "another object" is comprised of smaller blocks from the identified objects. This interpretation is broader (and supported by the claim language) than Applicant's interpretation. The Examiner believes further restricting into what an object in fact is (as opposed to allowing it to be read under many broad interpretations) may help differentiate from the prior art of record. The following is a basis of Examiner's interpretation:

